

REMARKS

The Advisory Action of December 22, 2005, and the final Office Action of October 3, 2005, have been received and reviewed.

Claims 1-52 are currently pending in the above-referenced application. Claims 3, 11 and 13-53 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12, which have been considered, stand rejected. Claims 6 and 7 recite allowable subject matter, but have been objected to for depending from rejected base claims.

It is proposed that independent claims 1 and 23 be amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 5 and 6. It is also proposed that claims 5 and 6 be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single reference which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Kowase

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being drawn to subject matter that is allegedly anticipated by the subject matter disclosed in Japanese patent publication 63-232342 of Kowase (hereinafter “Kowase”).

It is proposed that independent claim 1 be amended to include the limitations of claim 6, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of amended independent claim 1 is moot, as are the rejections of claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 depending therefrom.

Akram

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being directed to subject matter that is assertedly anticipated by the disclosure of U.S. Patent 6,072,236 to Akram, et al. (hereinafter “Akram”).

It is proposed that independent claim 1 be amended to include the limitations of claim 6, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of amended independent claim 1 is moot, as are the rejections of claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 depending therefrom.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indication that claims 6 and 7 are drawn to allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. The limitations of claim 6 (and claim 5, from which claim 6 directly depends) have been incorporated into independent claim 1.

Election of Species Requirement

It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 remains generic to all of the species of invention that were identified in the Election of Species Requirement in the above-referenced application. In view of the allowability of these claims, claims 3, 11, and 13-52, which have been withdrawn from consideration, should also be considered and allowed. M.P.E.P. § 806.04(d).

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-52 is allowable. An early notice of the allowability of each of these claims is respectfully solicited, as is an indication that the above-referenced application has been passed for issuance. If any issues preventing allowance of the above-referenced application remain which might be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Office is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Brick G. Power
Registration No. 38,581
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT, PC
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: January 3, 2006

BGP/djp:eg

Document in ProLaw